

Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Bonner  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite, Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo

Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseeth Sandlin  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Cannon  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoolley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo

Loebsack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungrun, Daniel E.  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Shadmire  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder

Space  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Waxman  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

□ 2103

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). On this rollcall, 377 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

#### ORDERLY AND RESPONSIBLE IRAQ REDEPLOYMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 29¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 26½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute simply to explain to the House that the intention is to have one remaining speaker on each side and then proceed to the votes.

With that, I yield back the remainder of my 1 minute and invite the gentleman from Florida to close.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, throughout the evening, we have heard some very, very interesting speeches. I listened with great respect to all of them. I agreed with some, I disagreed with some, I wasn't sure about some. Nevertheless, it was a good debate at a high level. I paid special attention to the very distinguished Speaker of the House because in her opening comments, she talked about how Monday, Veterans Day, America honored our veterans. She spoke about the Veterans appropriations bill in great, glowing terms. I agree with that. It is a really good bill. It provides a lot of benefits for the veterans. There are 400,000 veterans claims backed up. That bill provided money to hire additional adjudicators to get rid of that backlog and get the veterans what they need.

The problem is that as she spoke about the importance of this bill and what a great bill it was and great bill it is, she failed to say that the House passed it on June 15, the Senate passed it in September, and here we are in November still waiting to get that bill on the House floor.

I say, Madam Speaker, let's vote on the VA appropriations bill.

I mentioned the fact that there were great speeches. But, Mr. Speaker, tonight we will not be voting or be recorded on how those speeches went, or what those speeches said, or what those speeches included. We are not going to be voting on opinions. We are not going to be voting on politics. We are going to be voting on what is in this bill. What has been said about this bill is not necessarily what is actually written in the bill. But we are going to vote for what is written in that bill. We will be held accountable for our vote on what that bill says, not on what some speaker said about it.

One of the things that I mentioned in my opening comments that I was really offended by is that this legislation gives constitutional protection to terrorists, the same constitutional protection that all of our constituents enjoy. I refer to page 3 of the bill itself, "Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the rights under the United States Constitution of any person in the custody or under the physical jurisdiction of the United States."

Now, that gives terrorists the same protection that your constituents have. And that's just not right. By giving them that protection, do we give them for example, do we have to read them their Miranda rights if we capture them on the battlefield? Do we have to allow them to pay bail and get out of jail or get out of detention? What kind of rights will we be giving to terrorists with just this one sentence that says they shall have rights under the Constitution? These are terrorists, Mr. Speaker. These aren't even people who are signatories to the Geneva Convention. They don't play by any rules. They do whatever they must do, and they have killed thousands and thousands of Americans, and they have killed thousands and thousands of the Muslim populations.

Now, something about this bill, on page 6 of this bill, "After the conclusion of the reduction and transition of United States Armed Forces to a limited presence as required by this section, the Secretary of Defense may deploy or maintain members of the Armed Forces in Iraq only for the following missions." Now, pay attention to this because this is what you will be allowing. For those of you that think you're getting troops out of Iraq, this is what this bill will permit. The Armed Forces in Iraq can be there for the following missions: "Protecting United States diplomatic facilities, United States Armed Forces, and American citizens." We do that now. That is one of the things that we are doing right now.

So you think you're getting out of that. This bill keeps you in that. The next paragraph, "Conducting limited training, equipment, and providing logistical and intelligence support to the Iraqi Security forces." We're doing that now. So if you think this bill is going to change anything, it doesn't because you are allowing them to stay

to do the same thing that they are doing now.

The next paragraph, "Engaging in targeted counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda, al Qaeda affiliated groups, and other terrorist organizations in Iraq." Mr. Speaker, we're doing that now.

On page 12, we go to the Iraqi Security Forces Fund provided in this bill. "For the 'Iraq Security Forces Fund', \$500 million, Provided, that such funds shall be available to the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of allowing the Commander, Multinational Security Transition Command-Iraq, or the Secretary's designee, to provide assistance, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to the security forces of Iraq." Mr. Speaker, we are doing that now. So if you think we're making a change here, read the bill.

It goes on to say, "Including the provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction, and funding, and to provide training, reintegration, education and employment programs for concerned local citizens, former militia members and detainees and former detainees." Mr. Speaker, we're doing all that now.

So this bill doesn't make very many changes if you think this gets you out of Iraq. It doesn't. If you read the bill, you will see that it doesn't. Now, these are things that we would be allowed to do under this bill. But if this bill were successful, and it will not be because I have an idea the President would veto it in its present form, we would have to do all of these same things that we are doing today but with a smaller force, a smaller force, minus the surge, for example. The change in policy that we all demanded early on came about, and it was called the "surge." The surge has had many positive effects. When you get to the point that The New York Times and the L.A. Times and the Washington Post are writing stories about the positive effects of the surge, you have to admit there is something real there in the surge. So do you want to go back and have to do all of the same things we are doing today with a smaller force? I don't think so.

We will have a motion to recommit. And if that motion to recommit is successful, we will have a bill that we can all vote for and that I believe the President would be willing to sign. So let's vote based on what is in this bill, not what the speeches say about it, not about the politics, not about the opinions, but let's actually vote on what is in this bill and let's support our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and anywhere else in the world where they might be deployed. We owe them no less. This bill is not a good bill today. Let's vote against it tonight and vote for the motion to recommit.

□ 2115

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman yielded back his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has yielded back all of his time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in strong support of the bill that is before us today. First and foremost, I want to point out that every Member on this floor, every Member knows that the brave men and women of our military have done a fantastic job, and every Member on this floor supports the brave men and women serving our country.

Mr. Speaker, too many of those brave men and women have been doing a fantastic job for way too many tours. Multiple tours. The last time I was in Iraq, I had lunch with a group of soldiers from California, one of whom was a firefighter from the North Bay in California, and he said, I used to have a house in your district, but I don't anymore. My ex-wife has it now. I said, I am sorry to hear that. He said, well, this is my fourth tour. I couldn't expect much else.

Our men and women have been put under a tremendous strain for far too long. Our military equipment has been depleted. Over \$100 billion is needed to bring our military equipment up to standard. Our combat readiness has been depleted. This bill, this bill is about refocusing our area; to transition, transition our effort into force protection, diplomatic protection, counterterrorism, refocus our effort looking into the future for future problems that we may have. It's long past time to refocus our efforts; it's long past time to transition.

This bill does represent a change. We heard from the previous speaker that there wasn't much change. Mr. Speaker and Members, if there wasn't any change in this bill, we wouldn't be facing the opposition from the other side that we are facing tonight. This bill represents major change.

This bill represents a policy change that the American people are demanding. They demanded it in the November election; they demand it today. It's long past time for this transition to take place. This war can't go on forever. We know that on this side of the aisle and we know it on the other side of the aisle.

A lot of comparisons have been made tonight with Vietnam. I want to make just one. I served in Vietnam with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. I didn't do anything exceptional. I showed up; I did my job. But there came a time in past Congresses that it was known that we were going to leave Vietnam, and from the time that we knew that our colleagues, our past colleagues knew that

we were going to leave Vietnam, until we actually left Vietnam, 21,000 Americans died.

They knew, our colleagues in past Congresses knew that we couldn't sustain that. We weren't going to be in Vietnam forever. They knew we had to leave. From the time they absolutely knew it on this floor until we left, 21,000 brave American men died in Vietnam. I was one of the lucky ones. I was only wounded. I lost a lot of friends. We lost a lot of fellow Americans.

We cannot make that same mistake. We know that the Iraq war cannot go on forever. We know that on both sides of the aisle. It's time for a major policy change. This bill represents that major policy change. I urge everyone to vote "aye" for the underlying bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, after my oversight trips to Iraq in July and August of 2006, I concluded we needed to encourage the Iraqi government, and specifically Prime Minister Maliki, to take stronger action to improve the situation in their country, and that the best way to do this was to set firm timelines for Iraqi security forces to replace our troops who are doing police work.

I believe a workable timeline will incentivize the Iraqis to make the hard choices necessary to ensure stability among the three primary sects—Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds. We need to motivate the Iraqis to set firm deadlines for provincial elections, reconciliation and amnesty, and a final drafting of their constitution.

During 2005, Iraqis set timelines to establish and ratify a constitution and hold national elections. They accomplished each benchmark successfully. I do not believe they would have achieved this success if we had not pushed Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds to resolve their differences and compromise in order to meet the timelines we helped set.

The United States went into Iraq on a bipartisan basis, with two-thirds of the House and three-quarters of the Senate voting to authorize the use of force. I believe we need to draw down the majority of our troops on a bipartisan basis, and have sought to achieve bipartisan solutions to improve our operations and reduce the violence.

While H.R. 4156 is by no means a perfect solution, it does propose a tight, but arguably reasonable, timeline for drawdown of troops in Iraq similar to one I proposed earlier this year. It should help bridge the gap between Republicans and Democrats on the most important issue of our time. The bill would require our commanders to begin a redeployment of our troops in harms way within a month, and set a target date of December 15, 2008, to complete the task.

For me, a better bill would have been to give Iraqis and our troops an additional six months to complete the drawdown, but given this bill sets a target date, rather than a withdrawal date, it gives needed flexibility to our military leadership.

I do not believe we have the force structure to maintain the number of troops in Iraq now, and certainly do not have the capacity to increase the force.

Our troops have performed extraordinarily well, but it is unreasonable for us to ask them to return to Iraq for a third or fourth tour. I also believe it was a significant mistake to extend

their tours from 12 to 15 months and would be unconscionable to consider extending their tours beyond 15 months. Based on our military's current manpower, we will need to begin to draw down our forces by the beginning of 2008, and it would be wise to let the Iraqis know now this reduction will take place.

While I support this bill, I am disappointed the majority still has not allowed a single amendment on any Iraq-related bill. As I have said before, it is pretty arrogant to think we would criticize Iraqis for not being able to compromise and find common ground when Republicans and Democrats are unable to compromise and find common ground on the most important issue facing our Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to call for the passage of H.R. 4156, the "Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Act." The war in Iraq cannot be won through the use of military force or another troop surge. The majority of the American people do not support the war in Iraq; a recent study stated that nearly 7 in 10 Americans oppose the war. Since the war began in 2003, 3,859 brave U.S. troops have died in Iraq. In 2007 the death toll has already reached 860 soldiers who have lost their lives, making it the worst year yet for the American military in Iraq. Currently, 28,400 soldiers have been wounded in Iraq since the war began with 12,750 suffering injuries so serious they were prevented from returning to duty.

President Bush's failed Iraq policies offer a war with no end in sight. There is no progress on political reconciliation between Shiites and Sunnis in the Iraqi government. Just this week, it was reported that the U.S. effort to organize nearly 70,000 local Sunni fighters to solidify security gains in Iraq is facing severe political and logistical challenges as the central government resists in incorporating them into the Iraqi police and army. Last month, the Shiite political alliance of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki called the U.S. military to halt the recruitments of Sunnis.

The bill in the house tonight will require the start of the redeployment of U.S. forces within 30 days of enactment, with a goal completion of redeployment by December 15, 2008. It will require a transition in the mission of U.S. forces in Iraq from primarily combat to force protection and diplomatic protection; limited support to Iraqi security forces; and targeted counterterrorism operations. H.R. 4156 will prohibit deployment of U.S. troops to Iraq who are not fully trained and fully equipped. The legislation also calls for an extension to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel of the current prohibitions in the Army Field Manual against torture. The bill will also provide to meet the immediate need of our troops, but defers consideration of the remainder of the President's nearly \$200 billion request. At the current rate of expenditure, the additional funds will last 4 months.

Many insist that American troops cannot leave Iraq until we have achieved victory; and democracy has been established. History has shown us that civil wars and insurgencies are ended only through rigorous diplomacy, economic development, and national reconciliation between former enemies; not by a troop surge and an endless war. Diplomacy works, and now more than ever is the time to implement the recommendations of the Baker Hamilton Commission, and call for a regional peace summit in the Middle East.

Let's bring all parties who are involved in the conflict to the peace table, so they can begin to resolve their differences. If international diplomacy ended the intractable conflicts in Northern Ireland, the Balkans, the conflict between Israel and Egypt, and Rwanda; then international diplomacy can work in Iraq. Once we begin the strategic withdrawal of U.S. troops out of Iraq, and show the Iraqi people we do not wish to occupy their country, then and only then can we begin the real possibility of having an effective international peace conference.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House today is straightforward. Do we think the President's Iraq policy is working so well that we should give him another \$200 billion to continue it, or do we need a fundamental change in direction?

I truly believe we need to change an Iraq policy that is simply not working. From the beginning, the Bush administration has been wrong about the war in Iraq. If you set aside the administration's rhetoric, the reality is that the surge has not worked. The goal of the surge was to give the Iraqi Government breathing space to make the political decisions necessary to reduce the violence that is tearing Iraq apart. But 11 months into the troop surge, progress on political reconciliation continues to be all but nonexistent. Meanwhile, 2007 has already been the deadliest year for American troops since the start of the war in Iraq.

There is a clear choice before us. If you are satisfied with how the Bush administration has been conducting the war for the last 4½ years, you should oppose this bill. If, on the other hand, you believe the administration's strategy isn't working and want to require the President to change course, you should vote for this legislation.

Whatever small chance there is of the Iraqi factions coming together, it will not happen as long as the U.S. military commitment in Iraq remains open-ended. We need to change course.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the majority party's Iraq supplemental appropriations bill.

It is baffling that at the precise moment when the surge in Iraq is producing positive results, the majority party would like to pull the rug out from underneath our troops.

Violence is down. Sunnis in al Anbar have allied with U.S. forces against al Qaeda. Baghdad is regaining some sense of normalcy.

By no means can we declare "victory" but our troops can rightfully claim progress. Despite these positive developments, the majority party wants to withdraw our forces—as if the enemy won't follow us home.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: are they prepared to take responsibility for the disastrous consequences of an early withdrawal?

Are they prepared to witness the chaos and destruction in Iraq?

Most importantly, are they willing to pass this responsibility on to the next generation of Americans who may be forced to finish the job we did not have the courage to complete?

My colleagues are right: we have made a significant financial and personal investment in Iraq. Let us have the courage of our convictions to see it through.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and pass a clean supplemental bill that provides

support to those who are fighting and dying. We owe them that much.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Iraq Redeployment Act which sets forth a realistic strategy for the responsible redeployment of our combat troops in Iraq. The Bush Administration has requested another \$200 billion dollar blank check for the war in Iraq to pursue a flawed strategy that has no end in sight and which continually puts our brave men and women in the armed services in the middle of Iraq's civil war.

The indefinite presence of American forces in Iraq has allowed the different factions there to postpone making the difficult compromises necessary to achieve stability and political reconciliation. Our intelligence community has publicly concluded that the political situation in Iraq is getting worse, not better. We cannot ask our troops to remain in Iraq when the different Iraqi factions have refused to take the steps necessary to achieve a greater stability.

We must embark on a new direction in Iraq. That's what this legislation will do. It allocates \$50 billion for the purpose of beginning to responsibly redeploy our combat forces out of Iraq by the target date of December 15, 2008. The troops that would remain in Iraq beyond that date would focus on the more limited missions of training Iraqi security forces, providing logistical and intelligence support for the Iraqi security forces, and engaging in targeted counter-terrorist operations against Al-Qaeda and affiliated groups.

As the legislation states, "the primary purpose of funds made available by the Act should be to transition the mission of the United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war." This bill also states that the reduction of our armed forces in Iraq "shall be implemented in conjunction with a comprehensive diplomatic, political and economic strategy that includes sustained engagement with Iraq's neighbors and the international community for the purpose of working collectively to bring stability to Iraq"—a strategy recommended by the bipartisan Iraq Study Group that the Administration has failed to pursue with any vigor or urgency.

This legislation also prohibits the deployment of any troops not fully equipped or trained, and extends to all U.S. Government agencies and personnel the limitations in the U.S. Army Field Manual on permissible interrogation techniques. We must send a strong message to the world that we do not support or condone torture.

We are on the wrong path in Iraq. This bill provides a much needed change in direction that will strengthen our national security, improve our position in the region and bring our men and women safely home.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, one need look no further than the chaos in Pakistan or the deteriorating situation in Afghanistan to understand that troop levels in Iraq cannot be maintained—and that the surge, which I have always opposed, has done nothing to achieve political stability.

Today, with this bridge funding vote, Congress signals to the White House yet again that enough is enough, that the combat mission in Iraq must end, and that we will force that change.

No one in this chamber questions the courage or commitment of our brave women and men in uniform or their willingness to tackle

any challenge put before them. But we have sent them on an ill-defined mission with no apparent end point, and which consumes staggering amounts of our talent and treasure at the expense of countless other priorities.

This bill also redresses a glaring loophole in the Military Commissions Act—a bill I strongly opposed. By requiring that all U.S. Government agencies and personnel must adhere to interrogation techniques contained in the Army Field Manual, we send an unmistakable signal to the rest of the world that the United States—the world's oldest functioning democracy—does not permit cruel, inhumane and degrading practices, or torture, and complies fully with Federal law banning torture and our international obligations.

The Iraq Troop Redeployment Bill is good policy, and long overdue.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act. This bill will begin the long-overdue withdrawal of American troops from Iraq.

Yesterday, the President vetoed the Labor and Health and Human Services-Education appropriations bill, which is the bill that provides funding for the National Institutes of Health, the Center for Disease Control, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, the Education Department, Pell Grants, and educational programs for the disadvantaged. He vetoed this bill because it contained a 2 percent increase over his request—an increase of \$10 billion in a Labor HHS bill of roughly \$600 billion. The President opposes even a 2 percent increase in the funding for these programs.

Meanwhile, the President has requested almost \$200 billion more for his failed war in Iraq. That would make the total cost of the war in Iraq so far to over \$600 billion and climbing, with no end in sight. President Bush's refusal to change course in Iraq is shocking, his failure to allow adequate rest for our soldiers between tours of duty is outrageous, and his demand for another \$200 billion blank check for his war in Iraq while vetoing LIHEAP for the poor, education for disadvantaged children, Pell Grants for college students, and research into cures for life threatening disease is simply unacceptable to this House. What a misplaced set of priorities.

Instead of the blank check for an endless war, this bill requires President Bush to begin withdrawing American troops from Iraq within 30 days. Instead of unfairly sending inadequately equipped soldiers on multiple tours of duty, this bill prohibits the deployment of any troops who are not fully equipped and trained. And at the same time, this bill provides the necessary funds, in full, to our troops who are still in harm's way.

Our Republican colleagues must make a choice: will they stand with President Bush's attempt to throw more money and more young men and women into the mess in Iraq, or will they join with Democrats seeking a bipartisan agreement on redeploying American troops out of Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to specifically note a provision of this bill, which I wrote, to bar any funds in this bill from being used for the gruesome and indefensible practice of extraordinary rendition. I would like to commend and thank Chairman OBEY and Chairman MURTHA for again including this language, as they have in every defense appropriations and supplemental appropriations bill this year. Through

the use of extraordinary rendition, as well as abusive interrogation techniques and extrajudicial incarceration of so-called "enemy combatants," President Bush has largely forfeited the mantle of human rights champion which the United States has carried for so long. We must reclaim the international moral high-ground if we are to cure the root causes of terrorism around the world, and we can start by banning extraordinary rendition.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman OBEY for this strong and responsible bill, and urge all my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4156, the Orderly and Responsible Iraq Redeployment Appropriations Act.

The Iraq war is a failure and it's time for our troops to come home.

This bill calls for a responsible redeployment and provides for the checks and balances Congress is authorized to impose.

The administration does not have blanket authority and America does not have a bottomless checking account.

The President's policy in Iraq has been a complete failure, and Americans are calling for this war to end.

Our troops are now trapped in the middle of someone else's civil war.

Our military presence in Iraq is not making our country any safer.

Instead, this war has taken the lives of over 3,850 soldiers, including 13 brave young men from my District alone.

From Rialto, 37-year-old Staff Sergeant Jorge A. Molina was deployed in Iraq and died in hostile fire in the Anbar province.

From Rialto, 20-year-old, Specialist Luis D. Santos was deployed in Iraq and died of injuries sustained when a makeshift bomb exploded near his Humvee during combat operations in Buritz.

From Rialto, 22-year-old, Corporal Victor A. Garcia was deployed in Iraq and died by small arms fire in Baghdad.

From Bloomington, 25-year-old, Corporal Joseph A. Blanco was deployed in Iraq and died by small arms fire in Taji after sustaining injuries from a makeshift bomb.

From Fontana, 19-year-old Lance Corporal Fernando S. Tamayo was deployed in Iraq and died while conducting combat operations in Anbar Province.

From Fontana, 24-year-old Sergeant Bryan A. Brewster was deployed in Afghanistan and died after his helicopter crashed during combat operations in Afghanistan.

From San Bernardino, 22-year-old Corporal Nicanor Alvarez was deployed in Iraq and died in the line of fire in the Anbar province.

From San Bernardino, 19-year-old Petty Officer Alex Ocegueda was deployed in Afghanistan, and died when a makeshift bomb detonated near his vehicle in Wygal Valley, Afghanistan.

From San Bernardino, 24-year-old Corporal Sean Grilley was deployed in Iraq, and died after being fired on by Iraqis during operations in Karbala.

From San Bernardino, 24-year-old Specialist Timothy D. Watkins was deployed in Iraq, and died when a makeshift bomb exploded near his vehicle during operations in Ar Ramadi.

From Ontario, 21-year-old Specialist Jose R. Perez was deployed in Iraq, and died by enemy small arms fire in Ramadi.

From Ontario, 31-year-old Sergeant First Class Rudy A. Salcido was deployed in Iraq,

and died when an improvised explosive device detonated near his convey vehicle in Baghdad.

These are the true faces of the war. My deepest prayers go out to their families.

These soldiers are the reason why I am so adamant about bringing our troops back home, and why we must support this bill.

The President's failed policies on the Iraqi war effort must end. We are listening to America's concerns and will not stand by and watch this continue.

We need to bring back our loved ones and put our families here at home first.

It's time for America to put her priorities in order.

This Nation is in debt, but not because of domestic spending.

President Bush refuses to sign bills to pay for schools, children's health care, and to protect our workers.

However, he comes to us asking for another \$200 billion to continue funding the Iraq war.

With just one week's worth of funding for the war, my District would never again face a shortage of teachers, of nurses, or of police officers.

As a veteran, I voted against this war in 2002 because no one could convince me why we had to be there in the first place.

The President believes Iraq is making our country safer.

The truth is, it is has put us at greater risk.

Our military is stretched so thin that we are at risk of not being prepared for any future emergencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 818, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. In its current form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4156, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

(1) In section 101—

(A) strike paragraph (3);

(B) in paragraph (1), insert "and" after the semicolon; and

(C) in paragraph (2), strike "and" and insert a period.

(2) Strike sections 102, 104 and 106.

(3) In section 105—

(A) strike subsections (a) through (f); and

(B) in subsection (g), strike the subsection designation.

(4) Redesignate sections 103 and 105 as sections 102 and 103 respectively.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is a simple forthwith motion. That means a vote for this motion will allow the House to immediately vote tonight on a bill that can pass the Congress and be signed into law. That means that our troops in harm's way will get the funding they need before Congress leaves town for a 2-week Thanksgiving recess.

The motion would amend the bill to strike the provisions which have nothing to do with providing for our troops and are nothing more than political gamesmanship. The motion would strip the provisions that give our enemies a complete blueprint and timeline for troop withdrawal. The motion would strip the provisions in the bill which signal to our troops and our enemies that Congress will not provide any more funding for our troops, except for withdrawal. The motion would strip the provisions in the bill that substitute politicians' judgments on troop deployment for the judgment of our military commanders in the field.

At the same time, we leave intact the \$50 billion in critical funding included in the bill. We leave intact the prohibition on torture, which has been adopted previously by this Congress and Congresses before. But we strip the new provisions which could give terrorists killing our soldiers and our citizens constitutional protections under our legal system.

We modify provisions to more clearly express Congress's commitment to our troops and to bringing them home safely in victory as soon as possible. We leave intact a new requirement that the President submit to the Congress within the next 3 months a comprehensive, long-term strategy to achieve stability in the Middle East over the next 5 years.

As events of the last few months have shown, the situation on the ground has, and we all hope will, continue to improve dramatically. Congress has and will continue to debate the proper course of the war, as it should. However, we should not and cannot vote to hold troop funding hostage to that debate. The only ones hurt by that are our troops and their families.

As we go home to enjoy the holidays with our families, how can any of us look our soldiers' families in the eye and explain to them that we are withholding their funding so that we can score political points. That is just wrong. Our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen and their families deserve more from all of us.

I urge adoption of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Who wishes to claim the time in opposition? Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that I have a great deal of affec-

tion for the gentleman from Florida. I think he makes as good an argument for a bad case as you can possibly find. Let me simply say that this recommitment motion is very easy to understand, which is why it ought to be defeated. It simply gives the President all the money in this bill, unconditionally. It is simply a down payment on business as usual. It simply strips the timeline from this legislation. It renews the authority for torture. It eliminates the requirement that interrogation activities follow the Army Field Manual. Outside of those problems, it's a terrific idea.

So I would simply urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. I want the Members to know I carry in my pocket the names of 18 people who have been killed from my district. Two years ago, I said this is a failed policy wrapped in illusion. I am absolutely convinced that there's more instability in the Middle East today than there was then.

This recommitment motion works against everything we are trying to do. We want a plan. We want a plan in Iraq. We want stability in the Middle East. We don't have stability. Pakistan, Afghanistan, and of course Turkey might even go into the Middle East. So when you talk about victory, you're talking about stability, which we don't have. It's absolutely essential to put a plan in place that holds the President accountable.

All this time the President has asked for things and we have given them to him. For 5 years we have said to the President of the United States, You need money, we are going to give to it you. Now we are saying we are going to have a new plan, and that plan is going to change the direction of this war, and we are going to bring those troops who fought so honorably home to their families.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced the yeas appear to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 192, nays 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 1107]

YEAS—192

Aderholt	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Akin	Barrow	Blunt
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Bachmann	Biggert	Bonner
Bachus	Bilbray	Boozman
Baird	Bilirakis	Boustany
Baker	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Broun (GA)	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Brown (SC)	Heller	Petri
Brown-Waite,	Hensarling	Pickering
Ginny	Herger	Pitts
Buchanan	Hobson	Platts
Burgess	Hoekstra	Poe
Burton (IN)	Hulshof	Porter
Buyer	Hunter	Price (GA)
Calvert	Inglis (SC)	Pryce (OH)
Camp (MI)	Issa	Putnam
Campbell (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Radanovich
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Cantor	Jordan	Regula
Capito	Keller	Rehberg
Carney	King (IA)	Reichert
Carter	King (NY)	Renzi
Castle	Kingston	Reynolds
Chabot	Kirk	Rogers (AL)
Coble	Kline (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Cole (OK)	Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
Conaway	Kuhl (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cooper	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Roskam
Culberson	Lampson	Royce
Davis (KY)	Latham	Ryan (WI)
Davis, David	LaTourette	Sali
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Schmidt
Dent	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, L.	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Shimkus
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Drake	E.	Simpson
Dreier	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Ehlers	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
English (PA)	Marshall	Smith (TX)
Everett	Matheson	Souder
Fallin	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Feeney	McCauley (TX)	Sullivan
Ferguson	McCotter	Tancred
Flake	McCrery	Terry
Forbes	McHenry	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McHugh	Tiahrt
Fossella	McKeon	Tiberi
Fox	McMorris	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Walberg
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Walden (OR)
Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)	Wamp
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Gingrey	Moran (KS)	Westmoreland
Gohmert	Murphy, Tim	Whitfield
Goode	Musgrave	Wicker
Goodlatte	Myrick	Wilson (NM)
Granger	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)
Graves	Nunes	Wolf
Hall (TX)	Pearce	Young (AK)
Hastings (WA)	Pence	Young (FL)

NAYS—231

Abercrombie	Costello	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Courtney	Hall (NY)
Allen	Cramer	Hare
Altmire	Crowley	Harman
Andrews	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Arcuri	Cummings	Herseth Sandlin
Baca	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (IL)	Hinche
Bean	Davis, Lincoln	Hinojosa
Becerra	DeFazio	Hirono
Berkley	DeGette	Hodes
Berman	Delahunt	Holden
Berry	DeLauro	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Hooley
Blumenauer	Doggett	Hoyer
Boren	Donnelly	Inslee
Boswell	Duncan	Israel
Boucher	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL)	Ellison	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Ellsworth	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Emerson	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Eshoo	Jones (NC)
Capps	Etheridge	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Farr	Kagen
Cardoza	Fattah	Kanjorski
Carnahan	Filner	Kaptur
Castor	Frank (MA)	Kennedy
Chandler	Giffords	Kildee
Clarke	Gilchrest	Kilpatrick
Clay	Gillibrand	Kind
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Klein (FL)
Clyburn	Gordon	Kucinich
Cohen	Green, Al	Langevin
Conyers	Green, Gene	Lantos
Costa	Grijalva	Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT) Ortiz  
 Lee Pallone  
 Levin Pascarell  
 Lewis (GA) Pastor  
 Lipinski Paul  
 Loeb sack Payne  
 Lofgren, Zoe Pelosi  
 Lowey Perlmutter  
 Lynch Peterson (MN)  
 Mahoney (FL) Pomeroy  
 Maloney (NY) Price (NC)  
 Markey Rahall  
 Matsui Rangel  
 McCarthy (NY) Reyes  
 McCollum (MN) Richardson  
 McDermott Rodriguez  
 McGovern Ross  
 McIntyre Rothman  
 McNerney Roybal-Allard  
 McNulty Ruppertsberger  
 Meek (FL) Rush  
 Meeks (NY) Ryan (OH)  
 Melancon Salazar  
 Michaud Sanchez, Linda  
 Miller (NC) T.  
 Miller, George Sanchez, Loretta  
 Mitchell Sarbanes  
 Mollohan Schakowsky  
 Moore (KS) Schiff  
 Moore (WI) Schwartz  
 Moran (VA) Scott (GA)  
 Murphy (CT) Scott (VA)  
 Murphy, Patrick Serrano  
 Murtha Sestak  
 Nadler Shays  
 Napolitano Shea-Porter  
 Neal (MA) Sherman  
 Obey Shuler  
 Oliver Sires

## NOT VOTING—10

Bono Hastert  
 Carson Jindal  
 Cubin Mack  
 Doyle Oberstar

## □ 2146

Messrs. MORAN of Kansas and LAMPSON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 203, answered “present” 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 1108]

## YEAS—218

Abercrombie Chandler  
 Ackerman Clarke  
 Altire Clay  
 Andrews Cleaver  
 Arcuri Clyburn  
 Baca Cohen  
 Baldwin Conyers  
 Bean Costa  
 Becerra Costello  
 Berkley Courtney  
 Berman Cramer  
 Berry Crowley  
 Bishop (GA) Cuellar  
 Bishop (NY) Cummings  
 Blumenauer Davis (AL)  
 Boswell Davis (CA)  
 Boucher Davis (IL)  
 Boyd (FL) Davis, Lincoln  
 Boyda (KS) DeFazio  
 Brady (PA) DeGette  
 Braley (IA) Delahunt  
 Brown, Corrine DeLauro  
 Butterfield Dicks  
 Capps Dingell  
 Capuano Doggett  
 Cardoza Donnelly  
 Carnahan Edwards  
 Carney Ellison  
 Castor Ellsworth

Skelton Slaughter  
 Smith (WA) Snyder  
 Solis  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth

Sessions  
 Weller

Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Hoyer  
 Inslee  
 Israel  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kagen  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind  
 Klein (FL)  
 Langevin  
 Lantos  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lipinski  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lynch  
 Mahoney (FL)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Markey  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum (MN)  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McNerney  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)

Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Allen  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Baird  
 Baker  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Barrow  
 Bartlett (MD)  
 Barton (TX)  
 Biggert  
 Bilbray  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Blunt  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Boozman  
 Boren  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Broun (GA)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Buchanan  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Buyer  
 Calvert  
 Camp (MI)  
 Campbell (CA)  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, David  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 Dent

## NAYS—203

Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Doolittle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Ehlers  
 Emerson  
 Everett  
 Fallon  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Fossella  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gilchrest  
 Gingrey  
 Gohmert  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Hobson  
 Hoekstra  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Inglis (SC)  
 Issa  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Keller  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirk  
 Kline (MN)  
 Knollenberg  
 Kucinich

Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shuler  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Solis  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tauscher  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Walz (MN)  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Wexler  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth

Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Royce  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Sali  
 Saxton  
 Schmidt  
 Sensenbrenner

Shadegg  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thornberry

Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Wamp  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Lewis (GA)

## NOT VOTING—11

Bono Hastert  
 Carson Jindal  
 Cubin Mack  
 Doyle Oberstar

## □ 2201

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRALEY of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

## TIME FOR PAKISTAN TO STOP BEING A DICTATORSHIP

(Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, Thirty years ago, I was in law school studying, among other things, the Constitution and deepening my passion for freedom under law. With me at Santa Clara Law School was Munir Malik. That small Jesuit institution instilled in me a sense of duty to stand for principle that led me to this House. That same sense of duty led Malik to leave behind a lucrative career as a CPA and lawyer to return to Pakistan. Last year, he was named president of Pakistan's Supreme Court Bar Association. This May, he was the target of an assassination attempt. And, this month, he was arrested by our ally. Our ally? President Musharraf. His crime? Standing up for the rule of law.

Musharraf is liberating al Qaeda members in the western territories while arresting judges and lawyers who believe in law. Pakistan is using our money to do it.

It's time for Pakistan to tell us where Malik and the other lawyers are. Time for Pakistan to set them free. Time for Pakistan to stop being a dictatorship.

I include for the RECORD a letter from the faculty at Santa Clara Law